

REMARKS

With this Response, claims 1, 11 and 15 are amended. No claims are added. No claims are cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-22 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13 and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication No. 2002/0124082 to Ramon J. San Andres et al. (hereinafter “San Andres”) in view of US Patent No. 7,096,465 to Steven Dardinski et al. (hereinafter “Dardinski”).

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over San Andres in view of Dardinski as applied to claim 11, and further in view of US Patent Publication No. 2004/0148183 to Waqar Sadiq (hereinafter “Sadiq”).

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over San Andres in view of Dardinski, in view of US Patent Publication No. 2002/0069272 to Steven D. Kim (hereinafter “Kim”).

Claims 1, 11 15

Claims 1, 11 and 15 are amended to each recite the hierarchical representation of configuration data is associated with “management of the server nodes” and the data object is “accessible by all of the servers and the hierarchy having a root, a first subset of nodes branching from the root containing configuration data associated with all servers in nodes branching from the root, a second subset of nodes branching from the root containing configuration data specific to all servers of a first instance and a third subset of nodes branching from the root of the second subset, the third subset of nodes containing configuration data specific to a first server of the first instance.”

This amendment describes the hierarchical arrangement of servers taught by Applicant in the embodiment depicted in Figure 5 and clarifies the distinction between the content hierarchy described in San Andres, as well as the updating mechanism in the management configuration described in Kim.

Claims 1, and 15 are further amended to clarify how “determining if the configuration data stored on the other server nodes is out-of-date” is “based on the location of the updated configuration parameters within the hierarchy.” Specifically, this determination is related to the

hierarchy specified in the claims, such that “updated configuration parameters within the first subset of nodes renders all servers out-of-date, updated configuration parameters within the second subset of nodes renders all servers of the first instance out-of-date and updated configuration parameters within the third subset of nodes renders only the first server out-of-date.” Claim 11 is similarly amended.

In contrast, San Andreas, Dardinski, and Kim fail to disclose such a hierarchical representation of configuration data or a determination of whether configuration data is out-of-date “based on the location of the updated configuration parameters within the hierarchy, wherein updated configuration parameters within the first subset of nodes renders all servers out-of-date, updated configuration parameters within the second subset of nodes renders all servers of the first instance out-of-date and updated configuration parameters within the third subset of nodes renders only the first server out-of-date.”

Therefore, Applicant submits the combination of the references fails to disclose all the elements of claim 15 (and similarly, claims 1 and 11). For at least this reason, Applicant request removal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 15, as well as there respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests examination of the above-identified application in view of the response.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections of the claims have been overcome herein, placing all pending claims in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the above-identified application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit any deficiencies or overpayments in connection with this submission to Deposit Account No. 02-2666, and is requested to notify us of same.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 12/18/2007

/James M. Howard/
James M. Howard
Reg. No. 56,377

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778